

Wright State University

**CORE Scholar**

---

Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas

Faculty Senate

---

2-3-2003

## Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, February 3, 2003

Follow this and additional works at: [https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives\\_senate\\_minutes](https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes)



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

(2003). Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, February 3, 2003. .  
[https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives\\_senate\\_minutes/303](https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/303)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact [library-corescholar@wright.edu](mailto:library-corescholar@wright.edu).

# Faculty Senate

February 3, 2003  
2:30 p.m., E156 Student Union

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of Minutes for January 6, 2003** (Attachment G)  
(<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/minutes.html>)
3. **Report of the University President or Chief Academic Officer**
4. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee:** James Sayer
5. **Written Committee Reports and Attendance** (Attachment A)
  - A. Faculty Budget Priority Committee: James Sayer
  - B. Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty Affairs Committee: Carole Endres
  - C. Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav
  - D. Buildings & Grounds Committee: James Amon
  - E. Information Technology Committee: Vince Yen
  - F. Student Affairs Committee: Margaret Clark Graham
  - G. Student Petitions Committee: KT Mechlin
6. **Council Reports**
7. **Old Business**
  - A. Procedures & Documentation of Nominations for Honorary Degrees (Commencement Committee) – Barbara Denison (Attachment B)
8. **New Business**
  - A. Salary Inequity Appeals Process (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres (Attachment C)
  - A. Due Process Mechanism (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres (Attachment D)
  - A. Professional Development Leave (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres (Attachment E)
  - E. CECS Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav (Attachment F)  
(Details – Go to <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cecs2003.pdf> )
  - F. COLA Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav (Attachment F)  
(Details – Go to <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cola2003.pdf> )
  - G. Teaching English as a Foreign Language Certificate Proposal – Tom Sav  
(Details – Go to <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/teflcert.pdf> )
  - H. Minor in Criminal Justice Proposal – Tom Sav  
(Details – Go to <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/justice.pdf> )
  - I. GE Course Additions – Ed Rutter  
Area II (Non-Western World) and Area VI (CoLA)  
CST 242-4 Comparative Non-Western Cultures: Music  
CST 243-4 Comparative Non-Western Cultures: Art  
RST 271-4 Regional Studies: Africa  
Area VI (CoLA)  
TH 250-4 Script Analysis
  - J. Transfer Module – Ed Rutter  
(Details – Go to <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/wsuge03/senate/tmodule.pdf>)

## **9. Adjournment**

- A. Winter Quarter General Faculty Meeting: Tuesday, February 18, 2003, 3:30 p.m., 163 Student Union.
- B. Next Faculty Senate Meeting: Monday, March 3, 2003, 2:30 p.m., 156 Student Union.

### **Attachment A** **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS** **FACULTY SENATE** **FEBRUARY 3, 2003**

#### **Faculty Budget Priority Committee: James Sayer, Chair**

The committee will meet on January 27. An oral report will be provided to Senate.

#### **Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty Affairs Committee: Carole Endres, Chair**

Attendance: P. Pacifico, K. Malloy, R. Taylor, S. Hansell, T. Smith, J. Dooley, C. Endres (chair)

The University Non-Bargaining Faculty Committee (NB FAC) met on Friday, January 20<sup>th</sup> to finalize the attached policies: Professional Development Leave, Due Process Mechanism, and Salary Inequity Appeal Procedure. These policies are submitted for the Senate's approval

As you will recall, the NB FAC was established when the revised faculty constitution was passed by the university faculty last May. This committee is responsible for the "care and feeding", as Jim Sayer likes to say, of the non-bargaining faculty.

As you read these policies, the committee would like you to call your attention to several points:

1. All non-bargaining groups represent this committee including SOPP, SOM, CONH, instructors, lecturers, and department chairs.
2. Policy revisions must reflect all non-bargaining faculty not just instructors and lecturers.
3. Definition of non-bargaining faculty uses the term fully affiliated that is already defined in the revised faculty constitution so it is not redefined in any of these policies.
4. Colleges and schools will be responsible for stabling non-bargaining faculty affairs committees at those levels. If not, the University Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee will serve in that capacity when needed.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

#### **Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav, Chair**

The UCAPC report to the Faculty Senate for February 3 is at:

<http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/5fsrep.htm>

#### **Buildings & Grounds Committee: James Amon, Chair**

No report.

#### **Information Technology Committee: Vince Yen, Chair**

The (IT) committee's major work this quarter will be the development of a survey instrument for use by faculty of the university. We have a subcommittee responsible for its initial design. The first meeting of the subcommittee is scheduled on the 27th of January. We expect to get the survey instrument completed before the end of this quarter.

-  
-  
-  
-

-  
-  
**Student Affairs Committee: Margaret Clark Graham, Chair**

The committee will meet on Tuesday, January 28 at 1:30 p.m. in room 161 University Hall. Agenda items to be discussed include:

1. Investigation into the prices students are being charged for books.
2. The problem with not having sufficient numbers of books in the bookstore for students when textbooks are required for courses.
3. Investigation into allowing vendors to come to campus to attempt to persuade our students into applying for retail credit cards.
4. Investigation into our Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures. We have been asked to: a) determine the effectiveness of policy and procedures and b) determine if modification should be made to "tighten up" or streamline the procedures.
5. Determine date and time for next meeting.

**Student Petitions Committee: KT Mechlin, Chair**

The University Undergraduate Petitions Committee met Jan. 10 to go over petitions. The meeting was called to order at 9:15.

Members present: KT Mechlin (CoSM, Chair; Barbara Bogan (CoNH); Richelle O'Connor (CEHS); T.K. Prasad (CECS); Brabara Greene (CoLA); Fred Watson (RSCOB); Joyce Hail (Assistant Registrar); Kathleen Bidney (Office of the Registrar); Juanita Melton (University College); Pat Caprio (University College)

Members absent: Brent Campbell (Lake Campus) and both Student Representatives

The first order of business was to act on a request from Jim Sayer to return voting rights to the student representatives on the committee. This passed unanimously.

The next order of business was the petitions from each college. We acted on 40 petitions (amazingly this took us three hours!).

The meeting adjourned at 12:00.

-  
-  
-

**Attachment B**

**Honorary Degrees  
Procedures and Documentation of Nominations**

1. The Commencement Committee should consist of nine (9) members. Six of these should be faculty members appointed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. Three (3) student members will be appointed from amongst the elected student representatives by the Student Government. The Honorary Degrees Subcommittee of Commencement Committee shall consist of four (4) faculty members and one (1) student member from the Commencement Committee.
2. Two (2) faculty members should serve three (3) year terms, two (2) faculty members for a two (2) year term, and two (2) faculty members for a one (1) year term. No faculty member should serve more than two (2) consecutive terms. The appointment of three (3) students will be for a one (1) year term.
3. The chair of the committee will be appointed from amongst the six faculty members by the Executive

Committee of the Faculty Senate.

4. A majority vote of the full membership of the committee will be necessary to approve a nominee for an honorary degree; that is, five (5) votes will be required for approval.
5. The deliberations of the committee regarding nominees should be strictly confidential.
6. A request to present a nomination should be sent to the committee prior to any nomination. A request may be submitted by anyone affiliated with Wright State University (faculty, staff, students, trustees, or alumni). The request must be submitted by January 5 for both commencements in the subsequent year. The request should consist of a brief letter outlining the contributions of the potential nominee. The potential nominee should not be notified of the request nor should there be any attempt to solicit external support for the request. The request should remain as confidential as possible. The committee will review the request and determine if a nomination should be reviewed for further consideration. Approval of a request to nominate requires a majority of the committee, and such approval does not indicate approval of a subsequent nomination.
7. Nominations must include: (a) a narrative letter, in non-technical language, setting forth the reasons for the nomination; (b) a full resume of the nominee, including accomplishments, honors received, education and experience; and (c) a minimum of three (3) letters supporting the nomination from persons knowledgeable about the nominee's contributions.
8. Nominations may be made by anyone affiliated with Wright State University (faculty, staff, students, trustees, or alumni).
9. Nominations may be submitted after a request to nominate has been approved. The deadline for submission of all nominating materials, for both June and December Commencements is March 1.
10. Nominations receiving favorable consideration by the committee will be forwarded as recommendations to the President of the University who may subsequently recommend them to the Board of Trustees for further consideration and final approval.

11/19/02

**Attachment C**  
**Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty Affairs Committee**

**SALARY INEQUITY APPEALS PROCESS**

(Approved by Academic Council 10/03/94, the General Faculty 11/15/94, and the WSU Board of Trustees 4/14/95)

**A. Definition**

**“Non-bargaining faculty” will be defined as fully affiliated faculty who are not represented by a collective bargaining agreement. Non-bargaining** faculty salary raises combine across-the-board percent increases with ~~are based primarily upon merit; and to a lesser extent upon~~ market and equity **adjustments which should be evaluated annually.** ~~and other factors.~~ Research, teaching, and service merits and other relevant factors are assessed at the departmental level by the chair, the departmental faculty development committee (or its equivalent) **where procedures have been established to include this committee in the annual evaluative process** and ~~, and possibly by extramural reviewers,~~ with the concurrence of the dean **or by the Dean in the SOPP and CONH. Deans are responsible for the annual evaluation process for non-bargaining faculty members who are serving as chairs.** Differences in raises and in salaries between **non-bargaining** faculty members will inevitably occur. This salary inequity appeals procedure is subject to the university compensation policy as defined in the Board of Trustees' Resolution 94-8 and *The Wright Way: Policies and Procedures* Number 4210. The term “salary inequity” here refers to a perceived inequity in one’s own salary due to the department’s, college’s, or school’s allocation of annual raises over a period at least three years, beginning no more than seven years prior to the filing of a salary inequity appeal.

**B. Annual Faculty Evaluation**

**A performance evaluation will be given to each non-bargaining faculty member annually and a copy placed in the non-bargaining**

faculty member's department file. The purpose of this annual evaluation is to ensure the continuous improvement and development of the non-bargaining faculty member and to inform decisions about merit pay, reappointment and promotion. Department chairs/deans shall meet with their non-bargaining faculty individually, to review their progress and its impact on the faculty member's retention and/or promotion. The non-bargaining faculty member may add personal commentary to these annual performance evaluations and that commentary shall be included in the non-bargaining faculty member's department file. Non-bargaining faculty who wish to be considered for promotion can request such review in writing to the chair/dean. A written review shall be prepared by the chair/dean and given to the non-bargaining faculty member and placed in the faculty member's department file.

In the annual evaluation letter (~~Faculty Handbook, Section Two, Revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotion and Tenure, VI. H.~~), a **non-bargaining** faculty member is informed of any deficiencies so that efforts to improve performance may be initiated. All departments and colleges or schools should have procedures whereby disputes about salaries and raises **by non-bargaining faculty** may be debated objectively and with all due consideration between colleagues. Under most circumstances, merit and other factors relevant to salaries are most accurately assessed at the level of departments and colleges or schools; likewise, it is usually most appropriate that salaries and merit raises be determined at those levels. Hence, this university level salary inequity appeal process is applicable only when appeals at the lower procedural levels (departmental and/or school or college) have not resolved the dispute.

Thus, the procedures and review process (as described in sections **C. and D.** below) are intended, first, to ascertain whether department, school, and college procedures for resolving disputes over a **non-bargaining** faculty member's annual evaluations, raises, and salary have been followed; second, to determine whether a salary inequity exists; and third, to recommend a salary (or salary range) to correct an inequity finding. It is to be emphasized that the findings of this process are not binding. However, in view of the good faith social contract between individual members of the faculty, the faculty governance structure, and the university administration, it is anticipated that the findings of these procedures, whether in favor of the complainant or not, should carry considerable weight with both the complainant and the university administration.

### C. Procedures

1. The appropriate academic unit will establish and inform all **non-bargaining** faculty of methods and criteria for evaluating merit. **Non-bargaining faculty members should play a role in establishing these criteria. Criteria that have been established by a department/school/college but not communicated to non-bargaining faculty members before the end of the calendar year prior to the evaluation year cannot be used in determining merit.** ~~In accordance with the university policy (Faculty Handbook, Section Two, Revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotion and Tenure, VI. H.);~~ An annual performance evaluation will be given to each **non-bargaining** faculty member. This evaluation together with the faculty member's responses to it will be used in deciding merit salary increments and will be kept on permanent file.
2. Each school or college is permitted but not required to establish its own salary inequity appeal procedure. Each school and college must inform its **non-bargaining** faculty whether or not it has its own salary inequity appeal procedure.

When a school or college wishes to establish its own salary inequity appeal procedure, the following rules apply:

- a. The college/school must inform its **non-bargaining** faculty of the rules ~~or bylaws~~ governing the college/school procedure.
  - b. The rules ~~or bylaws~~ governing the school/college procedure must include the following provisions:  
The final recommendations of the school/college procedure shall be communicated in writing to the complainant, the chair, and the dean, with a copy to the provost. This communication shall occur no later than the end of the academic quarter (with the exception of the summer quarter) which follows receipt of the written complaint by the school/college salary inequity appeal committee (or equivalent body).
3. A **non-bargaining** faculty member who is dissatisfied with his/her salary is obligated to seek relief from the department chair and from the dean, and, in colleges/schools which establish a salary inequity appeal procedure, from the college/school procedure. When a complainant has not been able to achieve settlement of the dispute by these mechanisms, the dispute will be reviewed at a meeting between the complainant, the chair, the dean, and the provost.
  4. If not settled in 3., and if the complaint involves a charge of discrimination based on race, sex, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, or sexual orientation, the complaint will be forwarded by the dean with a cover letter to the university Affirmative Action Office.
  5. If not settled in 3., and if 4. does not apply, the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee will handle the complaint. The complainant should submit to the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee a document containing:
    - a. A concise statement outlining the complaint, including the grounds on which the complaint is lodged and the years covered by the complaint. (As noted in section A. above, this period must consist of at least three years, and it must begin no more than seven years prior to the date on which the document described in this section B. 5. is submitted by the complainant to the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee).

- b. A clear statement of the relief expected by the complainant.
  - c. Copies of the annual evaluations written by the chair (or chair's equivalent) for the years under consideration, and any responses thereto.
  - d. Any other documentation that may be relevant.
6. Upon receipt of the materials in 5., the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee will appoint a 3-person investigation subcommittee consisting of: one member from the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee (to chair the subcommittee); one **non-bargaining** faculty member from the complainant's college or school; one other WSU **full-time non-bargaining** faculty member.

#### D. Review Process

1. The subcommittee will review the submitted material, acquire additional information for review, and report its findings as delineated below. The subcommittee will observe strictest confidentiality throughout.
2. The review and reporting tasks of the subcommittee will occur in the three stages a., b., and c. shown below.
  - a. The subcommittee will determine whether proper procedures have been followed. "Proper procedures" include the following:
    - i. Departmental merit review procedures.
    - ii. Annual evaluation performed for each year of the complaint period as evidenced by the annual evaluation letter and the complainant's responses.
    - iii. Lower-level (department, college, or school) salary appeal procedures pursued according to their respective guidelines.
    - iv. Meeting between complainant, chair, dean, and provost as specified in C. 3. of this Salary Inequity Appeals ~~section of the University Faculty Constitution and Bylaws.~~

If the subcommittee finds that proper procedures have been followed, or that proper procedures have been followed by the complainant but not by the administration (department, school, college, or university), then the subcommittee's work will proceed to stage b. below.

If the subcommittee finds that proper procedures have not been followed by the complainant, then the subcommittee will not proceed to stage b. It will instead submit a report of its findings to the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee no later than the end of the academic quarter (with the exception of the summer quarter) which follows receipt of the complaint by the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee.

- b. The subcommittee will determine whether a salary inequity exists. For this purpose, the subcommittee shall undertake the following tasks:
  - i. Assess differences in statements found in the annual evaluation letter and the complainant's responses. Where quantitative differences exist (e.g., ~~the number of papers~~, **scholarship**, teaching evaluation summaries, **service activities**, etc.), the subcommittee will verify the facts.
  - ii. Assess whether any deficiencies defined by the annual evaluation were addressed by the complainant in subsequent years, and whether such changes were noted in subsequent annual evaluations.
  - iii. Verify the complainant's actual salaries in the complaint period via the annual university budget in the university-archives main library.
  - iv. Seek any additional information needed for the investigation. In particular, the subcommittee may ask the complainant, department chair, dean, provost, and other involved persons to appear and testify; the subcommittee is empowered to examine the complainant's confidential personnel files relevant to the appeal. Likewise, the complainant, department chair, dean, and provost may choose to meet personally with the subcommittee should any of these persons so desire; it shall be the responsibility of the subcommittee to notify these persons of its investigation and of their right to meet with the subcommittee. (Unavailability of material or information requested from various sources but not submitted within a reasonable time period will be noted in the final report; the final report shall likewise note the refusal of any person who was asked to appear but who did not, or who otherwise failed to reasonably cooperate with the subcommittee's investigation.)

If the subcommittee finds that a salary inequity exists, then the subcommittee will proceed to stage c.

If the subcommittee finds that no salary inequity exists, then the subcommittee will not proceed to stage c. It will instead submit a report of its findings to the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee no later than the end of the academic quarter (with the exception of the summer quarter) which follows receipt of the complaint by the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee.

- c. The subcommittee will determine a dollar amount, or a range of dollar amounts, which would remove the salary inequity. For this purpose, the subcommittee may seek any additional information needed. In particular, if the subcommittee wishes, it may seek information regarding salary levels or faculty productivity at suitably chosen other universities as well as at Wright State, salary

statistics from appropriate professional organizations, or other market value estimates; or other information from sources internal or external to Wright State. The solicitation of such information from sources external to the university is made solely in support of the committee's efforts to determine if a salary inequity exists within the framework of Wright State's compensation policy. (Unavailability of material or information requested from various sources but not submitted within a reasonable time period will be noted in the final report.)

The subcommittee will submit a report of its findings to the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee no later than the end of the academic quarter (with the exception of the summer quarter) which follows receipt of the complaint by the University Faculty Affairs Committee.

3. The University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee will review the subcommittee's report. The University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee will give copies of the subcommittee's report and the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee's recommendations (if any) to the complainant, the chair, the dean, the provost, and the university president.
4. The provost will respond to the subcommittee's report and to the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee's recommendations (if any) in a written statement to the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee and the complainant within thirty days of receipt.

If the subcommittee's report includes a dollar amount (or range of dollar amounts) as in 2. c. above, *and* the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee does not explicitly recommend against adopting this dollar amount (or range of dollar amounts), and the provost does not accept this dollar amount (or range of dollar amounts), then the provost must meet with the University **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee to explain the reasons for his/her different conclusions in an attempt to achieve consensus via collegiality. The subcommittee will attend this meeting if either the provost or the University **Non-Bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee wishes.

[The university president may, at his/her option, personally fulfill either or both of the duties of the provost listed under this section C. 4.]

#### E. Appeal

1. A **non-bargaining** faculty member may not re-appeal a decision reached under this Salary Inequity Appeal Procedure. However, the **non-bargaining** faculty member may submit a new appeal for a different (that is, non-overlapping) period of at least three years.
2. An appeal under this process (1-3 above) may not be undertaken at the same time as the complainant is pursuing other methods of appeal external to the procedures defined above.

### **Attachment D** **Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty Affairs Committee**

#### **DUE PROCESS MECHANISM**

(Approved by the Board of Trustees May 27, 1981; amended April 24, 1978; November 8, 1979; April 4, 1985; and October 1-2, 1992)

#### Preamble

The **non-bargaining** faculty and administration of Wright State University agree that this Due Process Mechanism provides an orderly method to secure prompt and equitable disposition of complaints. We agree to use the procedures in good faith whereby **creating** an atmosphere of mutual respect. ~~will exist for each other.~~

#### Introduction

The procedures presented in this statement are not ~~to be considered~~ a replacement for the generally accepted mechanism of administrative review. **Non-bargaining** faculty members are encouraged to discuss issues with appropriate administrative representatives at all levels.

These procedures are **also not** applicable ~~for~~ cases involving ~~the removal or suspension of tenured faculty or in cases concerning the non-reappointment of non-bargaining non-tenured~~ faculty when violations of academic freedom or proper notification of **non-reappointment** are alleged. ~~Procedures applicable to these circumstances are presently described in sections VII and VIII, respectively, of the revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotions and Tenure.~~

These procedures are not applicable to cases involving only salary disagreements. **Procedures covering these violations are addressed in the revised Salary Inequity Appeal Procedure.**

The procedures are presented as a mechanism which ~~would~~ allows for the resolution of areas of disagreement with the least disruption to the



university.

#### A. Definitions

1. **"Non-bargaining faculty" will be defined as fully affiliated faculty who are not represented by a collective bargaining agreement.**
2. ~~The term~~ "Complaint" is defined as ~~shall be interpreted to mean~~ an allegation by one or more **non-bargaining** faculty members that there has been a violation, misinterpretation, or misapplication of policies or procedures affecting the conditions of the faculty member's (s') employment, or that such policies or procedures are opposed to the stated aims and goals of the university.
3. ~~The term~~ "complainant" is ~~will stand for~~ the **non-bargaining** faculty member or members initiating a complaint.
4. ~~The term~~ "administration" is ~~stands for~~ the dean or chief academic officer at college/school (hereafter noted as college but meaning college or school) or university level, respectively.
5. The term "hearing board" ~~is stands for~~, at the university level, a five-member committee appointed **each year** by the **Non-bargaining** Faculty Affairs Committee from ~~the tenured non-bargaining faculty. or comparable fully affiliated senior level faculty from the School of Medicine or the School of Professional Psychology.~~ At the college level, a three-member hearing board will be appointed **each year** by either: (a) ~~an appropriate elected college committee~~ **a college Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee, or if one is not established at the college level, (b) the University Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee.** The method **used to select members of selection** will ~~to be determined by the college non-bargaining faculty. At both the university and college levels, a standing hearing board shall be appointed each year and shall serve until the new board is appointed.~~ The complainant and the administration may peremptorily challenge the presence of one member of a hearing board. Replacements, if necessary, will be selected in a manner prescribed in **C,2,b. VIII-B-5. of the revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotions and Tenure.** The hearing board shall elect their own chair. The hearing board shall have the authority to dismiss nuisance cases following deliberations.

#### B. Statement of Basic Principles

1. Every **non-bargaining** faculty member or group of **non-bargaining** faculty shall have the right to present complaints in accordance with the procedures described herein. These procedures in no way preclude the faculty member or group from seeking resolution through administrative review.
2. Publicity shall be avoided during the processing of a complaint, and the parties shall avoid infringement upon the rights of third parties.
3. No one who participates in these procedures shall be subject to discipline or reprisal because of such participation.
4. Administrators have the responsibility to consider and take action promptly, within authority delegated to them, on recommendations presented to them.
5. The failure of an administrator at any level to act and communicate the administrator's decision within the prescribed time limits permits **the non-bargaining** faculty member to proceed to the next stage.
6. ~~There are two levels at which a complaint can be pursued: (1) college, and (2) university.~~ The normal procedure is to attempt to resolve the problem first at **the college** level 1, and then at **the university** level 2. However, when the complaint originates at an administrative level higher than the college, the **non-bargaining** faculty member shall start the procedure at that level. If the complainant has filed the same or substantially similar complaint in an external state or federal agency or court, the college or university hearing board shall not consider that complaint unless the complaint is remanded to the appropriate hearing board by the external agency or court. Judgment as to what constitutes "the same or substantially similar complaint" rests with the college or university hearing board, as appropriate. Upon request of the college or university hearing board, the administration shall inform the hearing board in writing of each complaint filed by the complainant in an external state or federal agency or court.
7. At each level every effort shall be made to resolve the problem by discussion.
8. To ensure that the rights of the complainant and of the university are protected, neither party shall ~~ever~~ be denied the right to have counsel present. The complainant may ~~can~~ have a faculty adviser, **of any rank**, present in lieu of counsel.
9. **If the complaint involves termination of employment, During the exercise of this procedure, full pay shall be continued during this procedure up to the until termination of the complainant's contract.**

#### C. The Due Process Mechanism

The procedures shall consist of discussion and a hearing, in that order. ~~two phases, in the following order: (1) discussion, and (2) a hearing.~~

## 1. Discussion

The complainant forwards to the administration a written description of the complaint, stipulating:

- a. the grounds constituting the complaint as defined in paragraph A.
- b. the remedy requested
- c. that this complaint is submitted pursuant to the Due Process Mechanism.

The complainant and the administration shall meet to discuss the problem and to attempt to reach an acceptable solution. This discussion is informal and cannot be used later as evidence. The administration shall communicate its decision in writing to the complainant within five business days of the completion of discussion.

## 2. ~~A~~ Hearing Procedures

**A request for a complaint hearing can be filed within five business days with the administration**, if the aggrieved is dissatisfied with the administrative decisions at the college or university level and the aggrieved is convinced that further discussion will be fruitless. ~~a request for a complaint hearing can be filed, with the administration, within five business days.~~ A hearing may ~~can~~ be requested at either the college or university level, but in no case ~~may can~~ the complainant request more than one hearing on a specific complaint.

If ~~In case~~ a hearing is requested, **at either the college or university level, the following will prevail.** ~~procedure outlined in VIII. B. 4. through 12. of the revised Policies and Procedures for the Granting of Promotions and Tenure shall be followed.~~

- a. **Both the non-bargaining faculty member or members (complainant party) alleging the violation and those alleged to have committed or assisted in it (hereafter Referred to as respondent party) have the right to be represented at the hearing; to be represented by counsel; to produce witnesses, statements, or other evidence; and to cross-examine positions.**
- b. **Within ten days of the filing of the complaint, the complainant party alleging the violation and the respondent party may each challenge one member of the original hearing board peremptorily, and the individual challenged shall not serve on the board. If the hearing board is constituted after a complaint is filed, the ten-day challenge window opens when the hearing board has been constituted and both the complainant party and the respondent party have been notified of the hearing board's membership. The Non bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee shall select a substitute member, if required. There shall be no other challenges considered. The procedure for selecting a substitute member is for the two parties (complainant and respondent) each to submit two names who are eligible and willing to serve. The Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee shall submit one name. Each party can then mark off two names. The committee will select the replacement from the remaining name or names.**
- c. **All concerned shall be given adequate time to prepare for the hearing, which normally shall be held no earlier than fifteen days after delivery of the allegation to the chair of the hearing board. The principle of confrontation of witnesses and examination of evidence shall apply throughout the hearing. In this regard, both parties should submit the names of first witnesses to be called, a summary of their expected testimony, and a description of any other evidence to be presented. This information should be available to both parties at least ten days before the scheduled hearing.**
- d. **The complainant has the right to either an open or closed hearing upon the complainant's request, but a majority of the hearing board can close any part of the hearing in which it appears that the evidence presented will adversely affect the personal reputation of third parties, or if becomes difficult to protect the integrity of the proceedings.**
- e. **The complainant and the respondent parties shall each appoint a single spokesperson responsible for the conduct of the party's case during the hearing.**
- f. **In order to facilitate completion of the hearing in a manner equitable to both parties, the following operating procedure and time limits are suggested and shall be observed unless either party deems the procedure inappropriate to the case prior to the hearing being held. The chair of the hearing board shall be responsible for holding the time restrictions.**
  - i. **Time restrictions**
    - a. **position statement by complainants will be held to a maximum of ten minutes**
    - b. **position statement by respondents will be held to a maximum of ten minutes**
    - c. **questions from the hearing board will be held to a maximum of ten minutes**
  - ii. **Operating Procedures – complainant's witnesses**
    - a. **Hearing of the complainant's witnesses, called by the spokesperson. Each witness will have 15 minutes**

maximum for cross examination by respondent, plus five minutes maximum for cross examination by the hearing board.

- b. After all witnesses have been called by the complainant for first testimony, any witness can be recalled by either the complainant party, the respondent party, or the hearing board, allowing a maximum of ten minutes for questions by each.
- c. Maximum total time for complainant's witnesses, including recalled witnesses, shall be no more than two and one-half hours.

iii. **Operating procedures – respondent's witnesses**

- a. Hearing of respondent's witnesses, called by the spokesperson. Each witness shall have 15 minutes maximum per testimony, plus ten minutes maximum for cross examination by complainant party, plus five minutes maximum for cross-examination by the hearing board.
- b. After all witnesses have been called by the respondent for a first testimony, any witnesses can be recalled by either, the respondent, the complainant, or the hearing board, allowing a maximum of ten minutes for questions by each.
- c. Maximum total time for respondent's witnesses, including recalled witnesses, shall be no more than two and one-half hours.

iv. **Operating Procedures – board's witnesses**

- a. Hearing of the board's witnesses. Each witness shall have ten minutes maximum per testimony, plus five minutes maximum for cross-examination by complainants, plus five minutes maximum for cross examination by respondent.
- b. After all witnesses have been called by the hearing board for a first testimony, any witness can be recalled by either the hearing board, the complainant, or the respondent, allowing a maximum of ten minutes for questions by each.
- c. Maximum total time for hearing board witnesses, including recalled witnesses shall be no more than one hour.

v. **Summary statements by the complainant's spokesperson, the respondent's spokesperson and the hearing board shall be ten minutes maximum for each party.**

g. At any time during the hearing, the hearing board may vote to extend any of the above time limits.

h. At an appropriate time during the hearing, the hearing board may declare one recess for no longer than one hour. In addition, the hearing board can declare a break, no longer than two hours, for a meal if required.

i. A recording of the proceedings shall be made and preserved until the complaint has been settled, and a typed summary of the proceedings shall be sent to every member involved in the complaint. The recording (or minutes if no recording is made) shall be available to all concerned parties. Should the complainant not wish to have the proceedings recorded, the board shall keep detailed minutes of the hearing.

j. The hearing board shall deliberate promptly and send its recommendations to both the administration (to the college, if a college hearing; otherwise, to the university) and the complainant simultaneously within sixty calendar days from the date the request for a hearing was filed with two exceptions: First, if the complaint is filed between sixty days before the end of the spring term and the first day of the fall term, the case will be considered when the fall term commences; however, if the hearing board, the complainant, and the respondent all agree, the case may be considered before the beginning of the fall term. Second, breaks between terms within the academic year extend the sixty day deadline by a like number of days. The administration shall communicate its decision to the complainant within ten business days of receipt of the board's recommendation.

k. After the hearing is ended, the hearing board shall make a finding with recommendations, and it shall be delivered in writing to the university president and every member involved in the complainant process. The university president shall have thirty days to accept or reject the findings.

l. The non bargaining faculty member alleging the violation can appeal the findings and recommendations to the Board of Trustees within thirty days after receiving the university president's decision.

### 3. Continuation of Procedure

If the complainant is dissatisfied with the college administration's decision following a hearing, the complainant may request continuation at the university level by initiating a discussion ~~phase 1 (discussion)~~ with the chief academic officer. An appeal of the administration's decision to the university hearing board may follow in accordance with ~~paragraph 2:~~ **hearing procedure** above, but if a college hearing has already been held,

the university hearing board shall not be required to conduct another.

#### 4. Qualifications

If the complainant and the administration at any level agree that it is in the best interest of the university to ensure that a complaint should not proceed beyond that level and it is determined that the authority to deal with the matter lies at the respective ~~that~~ level, then they can agree to have the hearing board serve as a board of binding arbitration.

If the administration and the complainant agree, then the above procedure ~~may~~ ~~can~~ be altered to fit certain unusual circumstances.

### Attachment E Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty Affairs Committee

-

#### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT LEAVE

(Approved by the Board of Trustees June 8, 1977; Revised June 5, 1985 and December 1, 1988)

A. Purpose: The enactment of Section 3345.28 of the Ohio Revised Code authorizes the Wright State University Board of Trustees to approve the establishment of a faculty improvement program. At Wright State University this is administered as a professional leave program for full-time faculty. The purpose of the professional leave program is to advance the academic competence of **non-bargaining** faculty members and to enhance their contribution to the university as teachers and scholars. Professional leave is a privilege gained by **the number of years of service** to the university.

#### B. Definitions:

1. "Academic years of teaching service," as used in this policy, means a period of time during which **non-bargaining** faculty members are employed at Wright State University. Each such year consists of ~~one of the following:~~ **a. at least three of four consecutive quarters of an academic year beginning with the fall term of one calendar year and ending with the summer term of the following calendar year.**

~~b. For those non-bargaining faculty employed prior to September 1968, at least two of three consecutive trimesters beginning with the fall term of one calendar year and ending with the summer term of the following calendar year.~~

2. ~~"Full-time Non-bargaining faculty" member" means faculty members who are~~ will be defined as **fully affiliated** ~~that~~ faculty who are **fully** ~~affiliated with Wright State University, not represented by a collective bargaining agreement and who are not department chairs. for purposes of promotion and tenure consideration.~~

C. Program: Professional leaves are granted for planned programs of education, research, study, creative activity, travel, and other professional undertakings of importance to both the individual and the university. All leave proposals will be evaluated solely on how well they advance the academic competence of faculty members and enhance their contribution to the university as teachers and scholars. Professional leaves cannot be used to work toward a terminal degree.

Subject to legislative restrictions ~~and availability of funds~~ for this purpose, Wright State University offers three plans to its **full-time non-bargaining** faculty for professional leaves with pay.

1. Plan I supports the **non-bargaining** faculty member for one quarter at one hundred percent of salary.
2. Plan II supports the **non-bargaining** faculty member for two quarters at eighty-three percent salary. (The salary will be calculated on the basis of one quarter at full salary and two quarters at three-fourths salary.)
3. Plan III supports the **non-bargaining** faculty member for three quarters at fifty percent salary.

These alternatives are made available because the purposes of the professional leaves differ, and thus the length of time necessary should be variable. ~~(Note: For twelve-month faculty, the salary will be determined from a calculated three-quarter base.)~~

~~Subject to legislative and budgetary restrictions,~~ Each year the university shall provide opportunity for professional leaves for **non-bargaining** faculty up to a number equal to ~~fifteen~~ **twelve** percent (**rounded to the nearest whole percent**) of the eligible **full-time non-bargaining** faculty. ~~of the university.~~ This allocation shall be made by **rank for lecturers and clinical assistant professors, by school for the School of Professional Psychology and by college for the College of Medicine** ~~school or college~~ and shall be adjusted annually. **In addition, no college or school may have more than one lecturer or clinical assistant professor on leave during any one quarter.** In all cases, the final determination of eligibility, allocations, and awards of leave shall be made by the president

D. Supplement to the Professional Development Leave Program

(Approved by the Board of Trustees June 5, 1985):

A supplemental research/scholarly leave program (PDL) shall provide qualified **non-bargaining** faculty members with the opportunity to compete for two or three quarters of leave at full salary for outstanding research/scholarly projects requiring more than one quarter to complete. **The university will provide 15 supplemental quarters of PDL to be awarded on a competitive basis.** ~~The requests for supplemental quarters shall be judged competitively as part of the PDL approval process.~~ Like the regular professional development leaves, supplemental leaves can also be coupled with extramural funding.

Recommendations for supplemental leaves shall be made by the **college's Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee, or if one is not constituted, by the University Non-Bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee.** ~~appropriate college or school committee.~~ The final recommendation shall be made by the **subset of the University Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee.** ~~Promotion and Tenure Committee comprised of the college and school faculty representatives and the at-large faculty representative.~~

E. Eligibility: To be eligible **for PDL** an applicant must have seven academic years of teaching service as a **full-time non-bargaining** faculty member at Wright State University. A **non-bargaining** faculty member who has been granted a professional leave shall complete another seven academic years of teaching service at Wright State University before becoming eligible for another grant of professional leave.

F. **Procedures:** ~~Conditions:~~ **Non-bargaining** faculty members desiring a professional leave with pay in accordance with the legislation ~~law~~ should submit **to the Department chair/dean no more than a five page proposal for which the leave is requested.** ~~for their program through their appropriate academic unit to the university president.~~ The proposal should clearly specify the project planned, ~~the potential for advancing the academic competence of faculty members and enhancing their contribution to the university as teachers and scholars,~~ the number of quarter(s) for which the leave is requested, **required for the project, the need for one or two supplemental quarters, if requested, the expected outcomes,** any extramural funding expected or being solicited, and alternate plans if any requested supplemental monies (internal or external) are not granted.

**The department chair/dean will forward all proposals to the college Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee who will make recommendations in accordance with how well the proposal advances the academic competence of non-bargaining faculty members and enhances their contribution to the university as teachers and scholars.**

**All proposals, the Chair's/Dean's recommendations and the College Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee recommendations and a statement by the Chair/Dean indicating whether and how adequate coverage can be provided during the Non-bargaining Faculty member's absence shall be forwarded to the Dean, if appropriate.**

**After reviewing the recommendations, the Dean will forward his or her recommendation and the College Non-bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee recommendation for supplemental quarters to the University Non-Bargaining Faculty Affairs Committee.**

Upon termination of a professional leave, recipients are expected to serve the university for a minimum of one academic year. An individual who elects not to return for the ensuing academic year shall refund to the university an amount equal to the compensation received during the period of professional leave.

By the end of the first academic quarter following their return, the legislation requires faculty members to submit a report of their activities to the college faculty and to the university president.

All basic and fringe benefits which are provided by Wright State University shall remain current and in full force throughout a professional leave, except that any fringe benefit provided by another source during the period of leave shall release Wright State University from the obligation of providing the similar benefit. Eligibility for salary increments and promotion are also continued. A faculty member on leave will not be required to participate in university activities.

**No professional leave shall be granted that requires a compensating addition to the **non-bargaining** faculty of the university.**

**PROGRAM CHANGES**  
**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING & COMPUTER SCIENCE**  
**COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS**

**CECS Program Changes**

Biomedical, Industrial and Human Factors Engineering

- B.S. Biomedical Engineering A (Traditional)
- B.S. Biomedical Engineering B (Premedical)
- B.S. Industrial and Systems Engineering

Computer Science and Engineering

- B. S. Computer Engineering
- B. S. Computer Science (Bioinformatics)
- B. S. Computer Science (Business)
- B. S. Computer Science (General)
- B. S. Computer Science (Science)

Electrical Engineering

- B. S. Electrical Engineering
- B. S. Engineering Physics

Mechanical and Materials Engineering

- B. S. Materials Science and Engineering
- B. S. Mechanical Engineering

-

-

**COLA Program Changes**

-

African and African American Studies

- B.A. African and African American Studies

Art and Art History

- B.F.A. Art
- B.A. Art
- B.A. Art History
- B.F.A. Art Education
- B.A. Art History/Art Studies

Classics

- B.A. Classical Humanities
- B.A. Greek
- B.A. Latin

Communication

- B.A. Communication Studies
- B.A. Social and Industrial Communication

Criminal Justice

- B.A. Criminal Justice

English

- B.A. English
- B.A. English B Integrated Arts

History

- B.A. History

International Studies

- B.A. International Studies

Liberal Studies

- B.A. Liberal Studies

Modern Languages

- B.A. French
- B.A. German
- B.A. Modern Languages
- B.A. Spanish

Music

- B.M. Performance
- B.M. Music Education
- B.M. Music History and Literature
- B.A. Music

Philosophy and Religion

- B.A. Religion
- B.A. Philosophy

Political Science

- B.A. Political Science

Selected Studies

- B.A. Selected Studies
- B.F.A. Selected Studies

Social Science Education

- B.A. Social Science Education

Social Work

- B.A. Social Work

Sociology/Anthropology

- B.A. Sociology
- B.A. Anthropology

Theatre Arts

- B.F.A. Dance
- B.F.A. Motion Picture Production
- B.F.A. Motion Picture History, Theory, and Criticism
- B.F.A. Acting
- B.F.A. Acting/Musical Theatre
- B.F.A. Design/Technology/State Management
- B.F.A. Theatre Studies

Urban Affairs and Geography

- B.A. Urban Affairs
- B.S. Urban Affairs
- B.A. Geography
- B.S. Geography

Women's Studies

- B.A. Women=s Studies

-

-

Attachment H  
**WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
**Monday, February 3, 2003**

Minutes reviewed by University Faculty President James Sayer and University Registrar, Dave Sauter.  
Prepared by the Registrar's Office.

**I. Call to Order:**

University Faculty President James Sayer called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. in E156 Student Union. The Faculty Senate meetings are broadcast via videoconference to Lake Campus.

Senators: (those present in bold) **Bud Baker, Marjorie Baker, Carol Endres for Joe Coleman, Gerald Crites, Donna Curry, James Dobbins, Jack Dustin, Kim Goldenberg, Mel Goldfinger, David Goldstein, Ramana Grandhi, Maggie Houston, Elton Kerr, Jeanne Lemkau, Jackson Leung, Jill Lindsey, Audrey McGowin, Ron Kremer, Perry Moore, Mari O'Brien, Drew Pringle, Blair Rowley, Ed Rutter, James Sayer, Cathy Sayer, Michael Steffan, Dan Voss, Gordon Walbroehl, Mary Wenning, Norma Wilcox, Mitch Wolff.** Parliamentarian: Tom Sav

**II. Approval of the Minutes:**

The minutes of the January 6, 2003, meeting were approved as written (Attachment G to agenda). Six copies of the Corporate Appeal were brought by the President for review.

**III. Report of President**

- Undergraduate student enrollment for Winter quarter 2003 is up 2.2% from last year (259 students). Graduate head count is up by 4.8%, overall university head count 2.9%. The undergraduate credit hours were up 3.3% , graduate 7.4% and overall 3.9%. We realize that the graduate increases tend to go up more when the economy is not doing well.
- Learning communities have been an important part of our experience for new students. Retention rates for Fall 2002 – Winter 2003 is 92.2% vs. 81.9% for students not in the learning communities. Dr. Howard introduced this just a few years ago and we have seen significant impact. This 10% point difference is real because we have been following the retention rates, seeing the students taking common courses, etc. If we look at last year, the numbers for fall to winter retention rate for students in learning communities was 89.1% vs. 83.4% for students not in learning communities.
- In response to the request for corporate campaign material, I brought several packets to distribute. The packet's total cost has been \$3,268.00, about \$15.56 each. Corporate gifts to the total campaign so far equal \$12.6 million.
- An executive team met with the governor to encourage having no decrease or a minimal decrease in the current higher education budget and an increase in the next two years. In the major portion of the budget, the state share of instruction, there will be no decrease. The governor is also proposing a modest increase in the next two years and he is proposing caps. During the meeting, we mentioned that if there were going to be caps we would need flexibility. This was requested to ensure that institutions like ours, historically on the low end of tuition, would have the flexibility with new students to not be capped to the same degree or in the same place as all other universities that are charging more in tuition. The governor said that all of these helpful points would be taken into consideration and he has addressed them in the budget. He is to be commended because the state of the economy is not in good shape, and he has considered the needs of higher education. The challenge will be now with legislators, because they will not like even selected tax increases. I have asked the chambers of commerce to galvanize the business community to support higher education funding. Question from Senator Goldfinger - As chair of the Inter-University Council (IUC), what is IUC going to be advocating regarding the tax increases to be proposed and the Ohio Incentive Grants? Dr. Goldenberg - There are staff from the universities who perform public relations duties. Because we are not functioning under normal economic conditions right now, there is a potential for



selected areas to be increased. Regarding OIG, President Goldenberg is not familiar with the details and so did not comment.

**IV. Report of the Senior Vice President:**

- None

**V. Report of the Senate Executive Committee: James Sayer**

- None

**VI. Standing Committee Reports and Attendance (Attachment A)**

- A. Faculty Budget Priority Committee: James Sayer, Chair
  - Report regarding Adjunct Faculty Salary distributed at the meeting.
    - § University College adjuncts total 15 during 2001-2002 with a cost of \$75,000
    - § Total charge to WSU budget for approximately 800 individuals is over 2 million dollars. The Budget Committee requested a draft series of recommendations from Dr. Sayer regarding these numbers. These recommendations have been distributed to the Budget Priority committee to be discussed, revised and submitted for action during Spring quarter
    - § Senator Goldfinger asked regarding a breakdown of credit hours by college, and President Sayer will provide that.
    - § There is a professional journal dedicated to adjunct faculty called the Adjunct Advocate. Dr. Sayer consulted the editor of the journal and asked if there was any data to establish a norm or standard for adjunct usage. There are too many variables and there is great variance between 4-year schools and community colleges but no official, national benchmarks. We may have to establish our own benchmark here at Wright State.
- B. Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty Affairs Committee: Carole Endres, Chair
  - See report
- C. Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav, Chair
  - See report
- D. Buildings & Grounds Committee: James Amon, Chair
  - See the report
  - Dr. Amon commented specifically regarding the issue of dedicated vs. general classroom
  - Comment from President Sayer that Senior Vice President Moore will supplement the remarks at the March 3 Faculty Senate meeting
- E. Information Technology Committee: Vince Yen, Chair
  - See report.
- F. Student Affairs Committee: Margaret Clark Graham, Chair
  - See report
- G. Student Petitions Committee: KT Mechlin, Chair
  - See report
  - Senator Goldfinger asked for a report delineating petition actions by category, frequency, and results. President Sayer will ask KT Mechlin to provide this information for the March 3 Faculty Senate meeting.

**VII. Council Reports**

- Dean Thomas, Graduate and Research council will provide a quarterly report at the March 3, 2003 Faculty Senate meeting.

**VIII. Old Business:**

- A. Procedures & Documentation of Nominations for Honorary Degrees (Commencement Committee) – Barbara Denison (Attachment B)
  - § Senator Cathy Sayer asked if this document could be clarified, regarding items 1 and 2 of the Commencement Committee and Honorary Degrees Subcommittee and other verbiage in the document. Professor C. Sayer will come up with the revisions suggested. Senator Ed Rutter moved to table this item until document language is clarified: Approved.

## **IX. New Business**

- A. Salary Inequity Appeals Process (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres (Attachment C)
- B. Due Process Mechanism (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres (Attachment D)
- C. Professional Development Leave (NBUF Affairs Committee) – Carole Endres (Attachment E) Items A B, C approved to add as Old business at March 3 Senate meeting. Professor Endres commented that the overall process was to start from current policies and refine to address the current issues. Carole Endres asked that comments and questions be sent to her. Senator Rutter asked for a breakdown of the 390 faculty covered by the AAUP by college, particularly for SOM and SOPP, so they can be aware and participate in the process.
- D. CECS Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav (Attachment F)  
(Details – Go to <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cecs2003.pdf> )
- E. COLA Program Changes Fall 2003 – Tom Sav (Attachment F)  
(Details – Go to <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/cola2003.pdf> )
- F. Teaching English as a Foreign Language Certificate Proposal – Tom Sav  
(Details – Go to <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/teflcert.pdf> )
- G. Minor in Criminal Justice Proposal – Tom Sav  
(Details – Go to <http://www.wright.edu/~tom.sav/ucapc/0003/fsreport/justice.pdf> )  
Items D, E, F, and G approved to Old business.  
Item E and F program changes by College of Engineering and Computer Science and College of Nursing and Health based on program requirement being revised to complement the new GE.  
Senator Rutter commented that the policy on area 6, p. 13 of the CECS, needs to be removed.  
CECS may consider revising the proposal.  
March 3 Senate meeting will have other changes, if approved by UCAPC.  
Dr. Sav also mentioned that other colleges may have changes, and due to catalog timing, asked that UCAPC consider them as Old Business under suspension of rules of March 3, Senate meeting.
- H. Proposal for GEIC to add four more courses to the General Education for 2003  
Area II (Non-Western World) and Area VI (COLA)  
CST 242-4 Comparative Non-Western Cultures: Music  
CST 243-4 Comparative Non-Western Cultures: Art  
RST 271-4 Regional Studies: Africa  
Area VI (COLA)  
TH 250-4 Script Analysis  
Approved to Old Business for March 3 Senate meeting
- I. Proposal from GEIC for a Transfer Module. - Dr. Rutter pointed out the note at the bottom of page 3. Five of the courses in area six would not be included in the transfer module. The reason for this is that the Board of Regents Transfer and Articulation Committee would not approve these courses. However, the Transfer Module has been designed in such a way that if a student in the three affected colleges (College of Engineering and Computer Science, Raj Soin College of Business, and the College of Nursing and Health) has completed the General Education requirements they would also complete the transfer module, because these students take some substitute courses that make up for the hours lost if they took one of these courses to meet the area six requirement.  
Approved to Old Business for March 3 Senate meeting.

## **X. Announcements:**

- A. Winter Quarter General Faculty Meeting: Tuesday, February 18, 2003, 3:30 p.m., 163 Student Union.
- B. Next Faculty Senate Meeting: Monday, March 3, 2003, 2:30 p.m., 156 Student Union.
- C. President Sayer asked for interest in the President Elect position for 2003-2004 to then serve as President 2004-2005.

## **XI. Adjournment:**

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.